

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**REMARKS**

Claims 4, 10, 23, 29, 35, and 49 have been rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 26-27, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,681,229 to Cason et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 26-27, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(f).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 26-27, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,681,229 to Cason et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 26-27, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(f).

Since claims 1 and 26 have been canceled, and since claims 2 and 27 have been amended to depend respectively on claim 4 and 29 which were not rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicants maintain that the rejection of claims 1-2 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §102(f) is moot.

Since claim 53 was amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 4, Applicants maintain that the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §102(f) is moot.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 2-4

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 4 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the SAP business information system comprises a SAP Executive Information System (EIS)" (emphasis added).

The Examiner alleges that Hendricks teaches a SAP Executive Information System in col. 21, line 8 - col. 22, line 13. In response, Applicants contend that Hendricks discloses an Executive Information System generally but does not teach a SAP Executive Information System specifically as required by the preceding feature of claim 4. In fact, there is no mention of SAP or of Systems Application and Products anywhere in Hendricks. Therefore, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 4.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "said

09/893,990

17

system comprising a non-SAP bridge program adapted to generate the **Aspect file**" (emphasis added).

Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not disclose an Aspect file. Applicants' specification defines an Aspect file on page 7, lines 3-8 as follows: "An Aspect file is a file that is readable by, and may be processed by, EIS 12 aside for a possible conversion to resolve an incompatibility between the respective operating systems and platforms in which the Aspect file and EIS 12 are configured. Thus, the Aspect file has the property that EIS 12 would be able to directly read and process the Aspect file if EIS 12 and the Aspect file were functioning on the same computing platform and with the same operating system."

Although the Examiner alleges that Ziglin's database 134 is an Aspect file, Applicants respectfully contend that Ziglin does not provide any disclosure showing that Ziglin's database 134 satisfies the aforementioned definition of an Aspect file recited in Applicants' specification. For example, Ziglin does not disclose that the database 134 is readable by, and may be processed by, an EIS. Therefore, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 4.

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for "generating a report by a reporting tool of a **SAP** business information system using data included within an Aspect file" (emphasis added).

The Examiner argues: "Hendricks discloses a system and method similar to that of Ziglin, wherein formatted data is submitted to a SAP business information system for report generation

as claimed. See Figure 4 and the corresponding portion of Hendricks' specification, specifically column 21, line 8 - column 22, line 13, for the details of this disclosure."

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that there is no mention of SAP or of Systems Application and Products in Hendricks anywhere in Hendricks. Therefore, Hendricks does not teach use of SAP as required by the preceding feature of claim 4.

Moreover, the Examiner's argument for modifying Ziglin to incorporate SAP into Ziglin's invention is not persuasive. The Examiner argues: "Ziglin does show that the enterprise business information system could be any of those available to an enterprise, and provides examples of some major enterprise business information systems in the Background of the Invention section (See ¶ 0006). This provides direct suggestion for using SAP as the enterprise business information system within Ziglin's invention."

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Paragraph 0006 of Ziglin teaches away from the use of SAP, as evidenced in the following recitation within Paragraph 0006 of Ziglin: "Companies providing "enterprise systems" include SAP, PeopleSoft, Oracle, J. D. Edwards, as well as many custom systems developed by system consulting organizations. However, the problem with these enterprise systems is that they take years to develop, and once developed, it is difficult to convert important organizational data from the old systems to the new enterprise system" (emphasis added). Therefore, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 4.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "a

non-SAP bridge program adapted to **generate** the Aspect file" (emphasis added). The Examiner alleges that the database 134 is an Aspect file (which is incorrect as explained *supra*) and that the Layering Program 118 of FIG. 12 is adapted to generate the database 134.

In response, Applicants assert that the Layering Program 118 is not adapted to generate the database 134, as evidenced by the following recitation in Paragraph 0061 in Ziglin: "In accordance with this aspect of the invention, an application layer 118 may be used to **facilitate communications** between web applications 112 on web server 114 and enterprise database 134, for example using path 13" (emphasis added). Thus, the Layering Program 118 is merely adapted to facilitate communicate with an already-generated database 134, and there is no evidence in Ziglin that the Layering Program 118 is adapted to generate the database 134. Therefore, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 4.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 4 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 4 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-3 depend from claim 4, Applicants contend that claims 2-3 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 6-15

The Examiner rejected claims 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “wherein the SAP business information system comprises a **SAP Executive Information System (EIS)**” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “first example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 10.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “said system comprising a non-SAP bridge program adapted to generate the **Aspect file**” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “second example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 10.

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for "generating a report by a reporting tool of a **SAP** business information system using data included within an Aspect file" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "third example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 10.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "a non-SAP bridge program adapted to generate the Aspect file" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "fourth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 10.

As a fifth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "an Aspect file having **rollup records**" (emphasis added). The Examiner has alleged that Ziglin's database 134 is an Aspect file. However, there is no disclosure in Ziglin that database 134 has rollup records. The Examiner also alleges that Hendricks discloses rollup records, which is logically inconsistent since claim 10 requires the Aspect file to comprise rollup records and the Examiner has not even alleged that Hendricks discloses an Aspect file. Therefore, whether or not Hendricks discloses performing a rollup is irrelevant.

Moreover, the Examiner incorrectly alleges that of program line-up subroutine 430 of

Hendricks performs a rollup. In response, Applicants cite Hendricks, col. 41, lines 33-35: "The process program line-up subroutine 430 uses information from the MII 404 and PDEI 400 to develop a program line-up" The preceding citation in Hendricks demonstrates that the functionality of program line-up subroutine 430 is to develop a program line-up and not to perform a rollup as required in claim 10.

As a sixth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the **keygroup, rollup field, and quantity field** features of claim 10. Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner's arguments relating to the keygroup, rollup field, and quantity field features of claim 10 are confusing and unintelligible. Applicants cannot respond to the Examiner's arguments relating to the keygroup, rollup field, and quantity field features of claim 10, because the Examiner's arguments cannot be reasonably understood. Therefore, Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in relation to claim 10.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 6-9 and 11-15 depend from claim 10, Applicants contend that claims 6-9 and 11-15 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 17-25

The Examiner rejected claims 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 23 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the SAP business information system comprises a SAP Executive Information System (EIS)" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "first example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "said system comprising at least one non-SAP bridge program adapted to generate the N Aspect files" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "second example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23. In addition, claim 23 requires that N is at least 2, which translates to a requirement of at least 2

Aspect files. However, the only Aspect file alleged by the Examiner to be disclosed in Ziglin is the database file 134 (which isn't an Aspect file as explained *supra*). Therefore, the Examiner has not cited any evidence to demonstrate the Ziglin discloses at least two Aspect files.

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for "generating a report by a reporting tool of a SAP business information system using and combining data included within N Aspect files" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "third example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "at least one non-SAP bridge program adapted to respectively generate the N Aspect files" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "fourth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a fifth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "to generate the N Aspect files comprises ... to roll up the select records" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "fifth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a sixth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 23, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the **keygroup, rollup field, and quantity field** features of claim 23. See Applicants' "sixth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 23

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 23 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 23 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 17-22 and 24-25 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 17-22 and 24-25 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 27-29

The Examiner rejected claims 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “wherein the SAP business information system comprises a SAP Executive Information System (EIS)” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “first example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 29.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “generating the Aspect file” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “second example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 29.

09/893,990

27

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for "generating a report by a reporting tool of a **SAP** business information system using data included within an Aspect file" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "third example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 29.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "executing a non-SAP bridge program, said executing including: **generating** the Aspect file" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "fourth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 29.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 27-28 depend from claim 29, Applicants contend that claims 27-28 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 30-41

The Examiner rejected claims 30-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 35 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the SAP business information system comprises a SAP Executive Information System (EIS)" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "first example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "executing a non-SAP bridge program, including generating the **Aspect file**" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "second example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for “generating a report by a reporting tool of a SAP business information system using and combining data included within N Aspect files” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “third example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “executing a non-SAP bridge program, including **generating the Aspect file**” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “fourth example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

As a fifth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: “**rolling up** a portion of the dataset” (emphasis added). See Applicants’ “fifth example” arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

As a sixth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 35, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the **keygroup, rollup field, and quantity field** features of claim 35. See Applicants’ “sixth example”

arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 35.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 35 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 35 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 31-34 and 36-41 depend from claim 35, Applicants contend that claims 31-34 and 36-41 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 43-52

The Examiner rejected claims 43-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 49 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, because Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49.

As a first example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein the SAP business information system comprises a **SAP Executive Information System (EIS)**" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "first example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 49.

As a second example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "a SAP business information system using and combining data included within **N Aspect files**" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "second example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 49. In addition, claim 49 requires that N is at least 2, which translates to a requirement of at least 2

Aspect files. However, the only Aspect file alleged by the Examiner to be disclosed in Ziglin is the database file 134 (which isn't an Aspect file as explained *supra*). Therefore, the Examiner has not cited any evidence to demonstrate the Ziglin discloses at least two Aspect files.

As a third example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature of the system for "generating a report by a reporting tool of a **SAP** business information system using and combining data included within N Aspect files" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "third example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 4 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 49.

As a fourth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the feature: "executing a non-SAP bridge program, including ... **rolling up** the select records" (emphasis added). See Applicants' "fifth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 49.

As a fifth example why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 49, Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the **keygroup**, **rollup field**, and **quantity field** features of claim 49. See Applicants' "sixth example" arguments *supra* in relation to claim 10 as to why Ziglin in view of Hendricks does not teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 49.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 49 is not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claim 49 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 43-48 and 50-52 depend from claim 49, Applicants contend that claims 43-48 and 50-52 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 53-55

The Examiner rejected claims 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

The Examiner states: "Claims 53-55 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 5 and 16 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 5 and 16 above for the details of this disclosure."

In response, Applicants make reference to Applicants' arguments relating to claims 4, 10, and 23, in application to claims 53, 54, and 55, respectively.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 53-55 are not unpatentable over Ziglin in view of Hendricks, and that claims 53-55 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 08/23/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Ithaca, New York 14850
(518) 220-1850

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.